



Valérie Devon

Presents

# Vincent Reynouard editorials

Rejection of our QPC

The underlying reasons of a legal defeat

Sans Concession tv

Editorials tv

Friday, January 8 2016, the Constitutional Council rejected the QPC against the anti-revisionist law, which was filed on my behalf by Mr. Wilfried Paris.

The sages have therefore declared the Gayssot Act to be in conformity with the Constitution.

Is this a defeat? On the practical level and the state of things, yes. But on the level of ideas, no, because the Constitutional Council did not respond to Mr. Wilfried Paris. And here it's a point that should be emphasized, because the teaching that I draw from it is crucial.

### **A QPC which has not received a response**

Mr. Paris based his argument on infringement of the principle of equality of all before the law. The lawyer naturally placed himself to the point of view of victims or descendants of victims of crimes against humanity. With the Gayssot Act, some see their memory protected, while others remain disadvantaged. It is so obvious that in October 7, 2015 a politically correct daily, La Croix said: *"In French law, indeed, the Armenian genocide and slave trade are in fact considered crimes against humanity, but their protest do not result in prosecution."*

But, Article 6 of 1789 Declaration of Human Rights states: *"the law must be the same for all, whether it protects or it penalizes."* So, we do not see why some memories should be protected and others not.

In front of this unanswered argument, the Sages reversed perspective, they considered, not the victims, but those who dispute the existence of crimes against humanity. One reads: *"Considering that according to article 6 of the Declaration of 1789, the law 'must be the same for all, whether it protects or punishes; that the principle of equality before the criminal law does not prevent a differentiation be made by the legislator between different kind of behavior..."*

But, we will see that the actions considered by the Constitutional Council are not those of victims seeking protection, but those of the Revisionists.

The Sages tell us: *"Firstly, the denial of qualified crimes against humanity made by a decision of a French or international jurisdiction recognized by France differs from the denial of crimes against humanity acts characterized by another jurisdiction or the law."*

So it is here question of denial, resulting in the reversal of perspective. One does not talk of victims seeking protection, and would be treated unequally by the law, but Revisionists who questioned.

This is how the Constitutional Council has evacuated Mr. Paris argument. That's why we can not speak of a real defeat. For the QPC filed in my name did not receive a real answer. However, let's go further. Yes, let's consider the Constitutional Council argument.

## A worthless argument

The Sages declare that *"the denial of qualified crimes against humanity made by a decision of a French or international jurisdiction recognized by France differs from the denial of crimes against humanity acts characterized by another jurisdiction or the law."*

Well. But, why this difference? We expect an explanation, a justification. But, nothing comes. The Sages go straight on. This lack of explanation should arouse our suspicion.

What is this undeveloped argument, but on which one pass very quickly? A careful reading can give an answer: on one side there are french jurisdiction or recognized by France, and on the other foreign jurisdictions or simple laws.

Without saying it, the Sages, therefore, resumed the argument of Robert Badinter on the authority of *res judicata*. *"An authority protected only for decisions of a French or international jurisdiction recognized by France."*

Remember Robert Badinter words: *"The Gayssot Act prohibits the questioning of the judgment of the Nuremberg Tribunal with regard to the crime of genocide against the Jews and the Gypsies committed by the Nazis during the Second World War. Why? Because, there you had an international court decision, with, we known it, a public trial, contradictory, the accused had all the means to defend themselves, and in the decision, there is mention of the atrocious crimes committed against the Jews and against Gypsies, but mainly against the Jews by Hitler and his lieutenants. France is part of the judgment of the Nuremberg Tribunal. The status of London which created the Nuremberg Tribunal, France is one of the authors. At the Nuremberg Tribunal, there was a French judge. At the Nuremberg Tribunal, there was a french accuser. And among the Holocaust victims, there were no fewer than 73,000 who were Jews of France. Therefore, France at this moment, is bound by the respect that we owe to the authority of *res judicata* in Nuremberg. So the prohibition to question the judgment of Nuremberg is a ban based on respect for the authority of *res judicata*. History can not be fixed by law. The State can't punish the challenge of History. Frame speech and you will free the thought."*

But, this argument is worthless. We remember the response to Mr. Badinter by this lawyer: *"On this last point, however, whatever thinks Mr Badinter, the principle of the authority of *res judicata* has absolutely nothing to do here. A lawyer, even a beginner, can not ignore that this principle only means that the parties can not start a new trial. Now, repeat the Nuremberg trials, is obviously not the question here. It's just a matter of letting historians work on the archives and progress in the knowledge of the truth. But, no offense to Mr. Badinter, there is no principle of law that prohibits a journalist, a historian or an ordinary individual to form an opinion contrary to justice or an opinion, and a fortiori that gives the legislature the right to criminalize such an opinion. The truth is that Mr. Badinter does not believe a word of what he says, because he knows that it is precisely this freedom to challenge a court decision that has allowed, for example, the revision of the Dreyfus trial."*

Therefore, the Sages of the Constitutional Council used a worthless argument.

### **The Joker of the antisemitism**

But, ultimately, they do not care, because they have up their sleeves the eternal Joker. And this Joker, they pull it out now: antisemitism.

*"The denial of crimes against humanity committed during WWII, in part on national territory, has by itself a racist and antisemitic reach."*

Here we are.

Unlike other Revisionists, those who question the reality of the German homicidal gas chambers, and the genocide of the Jews under Hitler, convey racism and antisemitism. And this is not accidental. Because the Sages clearly specify it: this *"denial has by itself a racist and antisemitic reach."* In other words, this is not due to a malicious recovery that the "Fauressonniennes" theses could be taken in favor of antisemitism, no, they are inherently antisemitic.

The conclusion is obvious: while historians - Revisionists by profession - serve the knowledge, the Revisionists, which are called *"deniers"*, serve the hatred of the others.

So says the Constitutional Council when he explains: *"by criminally punishing the only dissent of the crimes against humanity committed either by the members of an organization declared criminal under Article 9 of the International Military Tribunal status at Nuremberg, or by a person convicted of such crimes by a French or international court, the legislator treated differently the actions of a different nature (...) this difference in treatment is related to the subject of the Law of July 13, 1990 referred to the above, which aims to repress racist, antisemitic or xenophobic acts."*

Hence, this ultimate conclusion: *"The complaint based on the breach of the principle of equality before the criminal law must be rejected..."*

Eh yes ! One does not have to treat in the same way one who serves nobly historical knowledge and the one who criminally vehicle hatred of the other.

### **And if Revisionists were saying the truth?**

But then, what if the Revisionists of Nazi gas chambers and the genocide of the Jews say the truth?

In that case, one can no longer pretend that their thesis would have by itself a racist and antisemitic reach. Certainly, they could be - and they will - recovered by activists who would

wave them for a racist or antisemitic cause. But revisionism is not as such an exception. Many theses can be misused for hate purposes.

In 1908, Arthur Heulhard published in several volumes a study titled: *"The Christian Lie, Jesus-Christ did not exist"*. The author wanted to prove that Jesus was a completely mythical character, mixture of Jewish fable and subsequent sham.

He wrote (p.40): *"Jehouda is not only the father of Christianity, he is the father of the horrible little Jew, that imposture humanity has turned into Jesus-Christ, and that 365 million civilized men love as the Son of God."*

It goes without saying, that in front of such a text, a christian could tell me: *"This is terribly shocking and further more the author thesis could be taken over by individuals who will go after the churches, to the priests, and perhaps to the devoted."*

My answer would be very simple, I would say:

1. Before being shocking, a thesis is either true or false. It is this alone that matters at first.
2. The book's author express himself perhaps with some vehemence, but nowhere does he ask readers to go burn churches or to knock out Christians. His only goal is to expose what he believes is a sham, in order to release from it some of mankind. If individuals take over his theses in an attempt to justify hatred, it's they, that will have to be condemn, but not the author.

Perhaps I will be accused of taking a distant example, so I would invoke this book published last October, and titled: *"The Climate Sappers"*, the author, Nicolas de la Casiniere, accuses the major capitalist groups to do nothing against global warming, or even to finance the lie industry, to lull the peoples. It goes without saying that these assertions can feed hatred against big capitalists, and their allies. But, it is clear that the author does not preach hatred, he denounces situations in which it seems to be the good of humanity.

Certainly, Nicolas de la Casiniere may be wrong, however, one will not ban his book, on the grounds that it would be likely to instigate hatred against many people from Bill Gates to the technicians of Total Group. All one can do is to condemn individuals who, based on this book, appealed to hatred and violence. But the author should be allowed to publicly defend the thesis that he argues in his book.

Well, the same goes with the Revisionists of German gas chambers and the genocide of the Jews.

When, in December 1978, Professor Faurisson presented his findings in his text entitled: *"The gas chambers problem"* or *"the Auschwitz rumor,"* he didn't call for hatred or the killing of the Jews. I will go even further, anyone knows the origin of the belief of the gas chambers of the Hitler youth, realizes that there was no Jewish conspiracy. I have already demonstrated it,

I will not come back to it again. The existence or non-existence of the gas chambers is a technical and historical problem, that can and must be studied objectively, i.e. without considering the alleged origin or not.

Whether it was Jews, Britons, Basques or Bantu, is irrelevant. In short, by himself the gas chambers of the problem is unrelated to antisemitism. It is a pure historical problem, that we must discuss with the light of science.

Naturally, the fact that thereafter, the Zionists have used the Auschwitz rumor to justify the creation of the State of Israel and the fact that, 70 years later, the Palestinian issue always seems insoluble, make it a very difficult problem. But no one forbids the expression of a thesis on the grounds that it could have social consequences, that may disturb some. Although, the issue of the Middle East is serious, even extremely severe, it should not affect the initial problem, that of the existence or non existence of Hitler homicidal gas chambers.

I repeat, this is a purely historical problem, and as such, it must be freely discussed.

True, November 4, 2010, while I was in prison and circulated a petition against the Gaysot Act, Jean-Yves Camus claimed to unmask my real purpose writing: *"Vincent Reynouard explains the real reason for deniers: "Without the Holocaust, Israel would not have emerged. Therefore, with the collapse of the myth, the Jewish state will necessarily collapse."*

Personally, I'd settle with what I have already answered: I believe the Jewish people should benefit from a national home, but I think that the question of that place should be asked and answered again, on a basic truth at an international conference.

For the rest, I would let the host of this blog, a woman I salute here ([gayssoterries.wordpress.com](http://gayssoterries.wordpress.com)), the task of responding to Jean-Yves Camus:

*"Mr. Vincent Reynouard stated one day, the obvious: without the Holocaust, Israel would not have emerged. Therefore, with the collapse of the myth, the Jewish state will necessarily collapse."*

*It's obvious, and everyone can agree with it, that if the gas chambers were a myth, and that this myth is officially recognized by the accredited historians, the State of Israel will lose its legitimacy in the light of the world, but will also lose as well its financial support. We add that many witnesses, historians, filmmakers, but also politicians who generously spread on the question of the genocide committed by means of a legendary weapon, will lose their credit. The stakes are enormous, revisionism is a bullet that one would like to be lost.*

*Mr. Camus cleverly transforms the obvious into a revisionist "project". From History he tumbled into geopolitics, but, if the gas chambers are actually a myth, it is not up to geopolitics, nor politics to decide what is correct or incorrect, but to the historian and to him alone.*

*That's where the nerve of this debate, that some are struggling to move into an area that is not his, but where probably lies a portion of the reasons why all expressions of a doubt about this is taboo and punishable by law.*

*So, in fact what Mr. Camus seems to defend, when tumbling in the field of geopolitics: the right of Israel to exist, to survive and to continue to receive reparations for an alleged genocide. Fighting the revisionist's freedom of expression, he makes us guess, in hollow, what he intends to defend.*

*We also note that he is silent on the beneficial effects of such a revelation and he forgets, (knowingly?) these thousands of citizens and former soldiers accused of complicity in genocide, these nations condemned to repent, to defend themselves tirelessly to be antisemitic and to pay the price of astronomical reparations for an act of genocide whose reality one refuses to discuss, but also, it must be remembered, the memory of these men and women, daughters and sons of former Nazis that one affables of a sinister legacy, by confining them angrily in a terribly sordid vision of their ancestors, their roots, their family and national heritage.*

*Mr Camus seems to watch only one side of the fence, taking advantage that the reader feels already strongly guilt (thanks to him) to turn the spotlight on an entire level of reality that he does not intend to consider a moment. What does not benefit Israel shall not benefit to others, if indeed, it is a historical hidden truth for decades? Does it need, this Jewish people, that one adds to the fate that was his (deportations, dispossession and oppression) an immunizing genocide? Do we have to infantilize and disempower Israel about a past that it claimed and which benefited it as much as he caused it unhappiness?*

*Finally, note that Mr. Camus uses two sophists methods, quite common, when he claims to reveal "the real reason of the deniers":*

*A - He makes here a trial of intent to Mr. Vincent Reynouard, but takes advantage, casually, to extend it to all the Revisionists. This way to turn things, allows him to discredit a group of whole individuals. This is an unverifiable trial of intent, but which, admittedly, has a large mental stunning power over the crowds.*

*The world is not just made up of Jews and non-Jews, hear it well! Because, Mr. Camus exalts a vision of the thing, whole dualistic and harmful, which, if we are not careful, could contaminate us.*

*B - He uses the argumentum ad consequentiam (the Consequence Argument): Mr. Camus warns his readers unpleasant consequences that could constitute revisionist assertion, if it were to be able to speak freely (which would generate certainly a growing number of readers, but also convinced ones). Mr. Camus omits one thing: the consequences, whether pleasant or unpleasant, are not proof of anything, with due respect."*

I will add only one thing to this answer: the insoluble nature of the Palestine problem, even 70 years after, does it not precisely lie in the fact that Israel was built on a historical lie?

Is the Jewish state not struck by the curse of the lie, whether from Yave or elsewhere?

This question may seem irrelevant or shocking, only this is not being antisemitic to ask it, because a Russian proverb says: *"In the pond of lies, there swims only dead fishes."*

What's happening right now in the Middle East?

And most of all, this question doesn't need to be taken into account, when questioning the existence or non-existence of the German gas chambers. Once again, despite its undeniable current implications the German gas chambers problem remains purely historical. As a historical problem, it must be freely discussed. And it is not necessarily being antisemitic, than reaching conclusions denying that existence.

### **The "*Holocaust*" religion**

So, why did the Sages of the Constitutional Council say that the Revisionists of the German gas chambers and the genocide of the Jews would necessarily convey racism and antisemitism? Why do they refuse to admit that these Revisionists could also serve the historical truth?

The answer lies in the 7th Considering who declares: *"remarks disputing the existence of crimes committed during the Second World War qualified as crimes against humanity and punished as such by a French or international jurisdiction in themselves constitute incitement to racism and antisemitism."*

The Constitutional Council thus affirms the existence of facts committed during WWII. For it, these mass murders have really been perpetrated. The Germans have indeed gassed hundreds of thousands of Jews in the gas chambers, it is a historical certainty.

Therefore, any calling into question can only be made in bad faith. In an unconfessable end. And since it concerns the Jews, this goal can only be antisemitism.

**We are, therefore, in the presence of a dogma. That of the existence of the German homicidal gas chambers.**

Is it surprising? No. Absolutely not. Nothing new here. This dogma was proclaimed in February 1979 when, 34 historians answered in these terms to Professor Faurisson (**Le Monde, 21 février 1979, p.23**): *"Do not ask how technically such a mass murder was possible, it was technically possible, since it happened. This is the necessary starting point for any historical inquiry on this subject. This truth it is our function to simply recall it: there is not, there can not be any debate about the existence of the gas chambers."*



One will reply, that two months before, Georges Wellers had spoken of the abundance of evidence. Certainly, but these evidence were worthless, in particular, there were none of a physical nature.

Besides, in May 1986 (**Zéro, May 1987,p.72 – VSD, May 29, 1986,p.37**), Serge Klarsfeld had to admit that after the war, no one was concerned about the collection of physical evidence about the existence of the gas chambers. 30 years later, there was only, he said, beginning of evidence.

It was the time when the exterminationists placed hope in Jean-Claude Pressac who was looking into the Auschwitz archives, finally available in Russia. But, after a short-lived illusion of victory, one had to disillusioned.

As the only definitive proof of a homicidal gas chamber, Jean-Claude Pressac produced a simple order, not even secret, of a so-called gas detector. It was so pitiful that in 1996, the Swiss historian Jacques Benac wrote: *"We must recognize that the lack of traces causes the inability to establish directly the reality of the existence of the homicidal gas chambers."*

I add that in their latest book published on the camp appeared in 2007, the Auschwitz authorities royally ignored this alleged definitive proof. The documentary vacuum plaguing the German gas chambers file is obvious when you visit memorials.

A few months ago, I went to the Caen Memorial and particularly in the space dedicated to the extermination process. Note the image that illustrates this process of extermination.



Where one would expect to see an order or a gas chamber, we contemplate a family picture.



Comes after this famous aerial shot taken over Birkenau on August 25, 1944, and that shows an important breaching of smoke behind the crematorium 5. The visitor may also look at this famous picture taken in August 1944 by the Polish resistance. One sees emaciated bodies in front of clouds of smoke. There is no evidence whether they were gassed.



As material evidence is produced this label of a Zyklon B box, as well as these few items found in the camp of Birkenau. The visitor thus, emerges from this gallery, without seeing any physical representation of a gas chamber.

The case of the Caen Memorial is not unique. [In this text](#), Professor Faurisson points out that in the gigantic Holocaust Memorial in Washington, no physical representation of a homicidal gas chamber is given. About the scientific adviser to the museum, Michael Berenbaum, Pr.

Faurisson adds: *"Mr. Berenbaum is an adjunct professor of theology at Georgetown University (Washington). Where a historian is needed, the Jewish organisations chose a theologian, so true it is that in recent years, they have replaced the history of the "Holocaust", by the Religion of the "Holocaust".*

This is undoubtedly correct. The trouble is that in France, this religion became mandatory. When, in July 1990, the legislator enacted the Gayssot Act, he rendered socially mandatory the belief in the dogma of the Hitler homicidal gas chambers. A dogma proclaimed 20 years earlier by 34 historians who responded to Pr. Faurisson.

**This July 13, 1990, the Republic became a religious regime, Hell was replaced by Auschwitz, and the Demonic Cauldron by the gas chamber.**

Given that the Constitutional Council is an offshoot of the Republic, it is not surprising that the Sages bow themselves before the dogma.

The consequence of this fact is tragic, indeed, Mr. Paris placed the question on the ground of the right, particularly on the principle of equality of all before the law. But from the time the Constitutional Council supports the Republic, become religious regime, then it's over with the great principles, law gives way to the defense of the Republican right. This is the underlying reason for rejecting the QPC introduced on my behalf by Mr. Paris.

I add that any other QPC would have been dismissed, for the same reason, whatever the right argument put forward, it would have been falsely rejected.

### **A dogma accepted by the mass**

Now, a question arises. This German homicidal gas chamber dogma, is it imposed on the masses against their liking, or is it, on the contrary, mostly accepted? This question is crucial, because history teaches us that a ban rejected by the majority, sooner or later falls under social pressure. So what is it?

First I will highlight the absence of plot. The decision of the Constitutional Council is public, everyone can read it. Since the beginning, in this case, everything is public.

In 1979, the gas chambers dogma was proclaimed in one of the largest french newspapers. Since 1990, the Gayssot Act is included in the penal code that every citizen should know. As for my sentences of imprisonment they were announced in the press, sometimes the front page.

However, no public event was organized where we would have seen signboards: *"I Am Reynouard"*. In this case, if powerful lobby act, in the end we can say People is an accomplice It is, actively or passively. Actively for a tiny minority which participates in anti-Revisionist repression. Passively, for the vast majority who do nothing about it. This majority can be split

in two: A small group who disapproves, but is silent, unable to act. And I really can not blame it. And a large majority that leaves do, because in the end, it approves inside.

This sad reality, I had a glimpse of it over the years, but particularly, thanks to 3 experiences lived in the family context, and that allowed me to understand.

In 1999 or 2000, I spent my vacation with my mother, in Normandy, with two of my three children, my mother invited three couples of friends, who had not seen me since high school. In the evening we all meet around a dining table. I was waiting for the moment when one of the guests asked me: "*So, what are you doing?*" After all, they had left a movie fan teen, and they find a father living abroad, author 2-3 years before a book banned by the Ministry of Interior. It was enough to ask me about my marriage, my children and especially my pretty unusual background. No, nobody asked me any questions. The whole evening went on talking about the rain and the weather.

Why? Because of course, everyone knew who I was. Everyone knew my troubles. And everybody knew that if we started talking about my life, we inevitably would come to address the issue of historical revisionism. So nobody asks me any questions.

The following days I was thinking. All these people, they practice liberal professions, our meeting took place, moreover, in a strictly private setting. And under the table there were no Jews or freemason or policeman, to listen to the conversation. In short, we have been able to talk freely without fear of professional or legal consequences.

So why this silence, why this refusal to ask any questions about my activities? The reason was obvious, these good bourgeois want nothing to do with revisionism. Final point. They did not want to hear a speech in which I would have defended my positions.

Years later, besides, I ask my mother: "*why do not you read what I wrote?*" She answered: "*Well, because I do not agree with you.*" Sure, we can not agree, a priori, yet nothing prevents to read or discuss around a table an hour or two, in order to document, to know. But no, when it is question of revisionism, intellectual curiosity is no longer appropriate.

By fear ? Come on! I repeat it, I met many people in private, which could have led to frank discussions, without any fear. But each time, people acted as if nothing had happened. In one or two instances, I tried to break the ice with a comment on the subject, the result: the guests were as if they had heard nothing.

The real reason for this refusal, Lanza Del Vasto summarized it as follows (**Louis Cattiaux, Le Message Retrouvé. 2007,p.XVII**): "*Fools do not want the truth to be discovered. They suspect instinctively that it would disturb them. If one showed them, they would turn away their eyes; if one put it in their hand, they would drop it; if they were forced to face to face, they would scream in horror and ran to hide underground.*" Unlike Lanza Del Vasto, I do not allow myself to judge people, nor treat them like fools.

But, 25 years of activism demonstrated the accuracy of this reflection. In their vast majority people do not want to know the revisionist argument.

Try to talk to them, they will make those who have not heard and very quickly divert the conversation. Offer them a brochure, they may accept, but will not read it, or not completely, or not with an open mind. Do you insist at every meeting? Soon you will not be invited.

Why that ? Because, the vast majority love the society resulting from the 1945 victory.

Therefore, people need to believe that National Socialism was the evil camp. They need to believe that apart from democracy exists only barbarism. This allows them to defend this system, Despite successive failures. And the more the crisis of this society will get worse, and the more they will need this belief, to justify their refusal of any radical change.

This reminds me of one of my uncles, who discovered coincidentally my book on the tragedy of Oradour, I had just offered to my mother, flipped it, was visibly impressed by the amount of provided documents, then put it back, saying *"it does not change the fact that the SS were criminals."*

This uncle was quick to close a book, whose content was likely to disturb its historical beliefs, source of his present political beliefs. Fiercely opposed to the nationalist right, it trusts that the Waffen SS were criminals, to be convinced that National Socialism was the evil camp. Therefore, he will refuse to read any research that would not conclude in this direction. And not surprisingly, this uncle also believes in Hitler's homicidal gas chambers. Nor for Oradour, he has studied the file.

Sure, he believes in it, because one taught him. So, we can say that he is a victim of a propaganda. But nor did he wanted to read my book on Oradour, - when he had it in his hands - he would not read a single text of Professor Faurisson, on Internet or elsewhere. He believes in the existence of the gas chambers, because it suits him. Publicly speaking. Therefore, it rejects any contrary information. This uncle is therefore, a victim of propaganda, because in the end he wants it to. And this is not an exception, the vast majority of people are like him.

### **No event "*I Am Reynouard*"**

But, in an individualistic society, where everyone sees only his own interest, this reality has a terrible consequence, because no matter if the one which we refuse to listen to information is muzzled. For those who do not want to hear, it makes no difference, therefore, why bother to defend its right? Those who want to enjoy these speeches just have to do it! And it is even more obvious in the case of a political opponent. Why defend the right of an individual apostle of a model of society radically opposed to what we want? Not only it does not concern us, but if it were to concern us, considering his sociologically unacceptable message, we would rather see him muzzled.

This reality, I have noticed it on many occasions, but particularly during a serious discussion with my sister. She was bringing out the perennial sorry speeches like: *"Yes that's right one should not persecute you for your ideas, but what do you want there are laws."* I replied that all dissidents violate the laws of their country. To which I was saying: *"So, why do we defend the right to free expression of Chinese dissidents, while here, before your eyes, I am persecuted."*

After several attempts of fallacious justifications, cornered, my sister could only answer: *"Yes, but these dissidents they lead a good fight."*

Well, we scraped all varnish from false excuses, and we had come to the real reason: *"You, Vincent, you're not leading the good fight, so if you put yourself in a bad case, it's your fault, and I do not see why I would defend your freedom of expression, because anyway I reject your message."*

At European level this principle is expressed in Article 17 of the European Convention on Human Rights which states: *"Nothing in this Convention may be interpreted as implying for (...) a person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of the rights or freedoms recognized in the present Convention."*

In other words, you can not invoke freedom under the Human Rights, for a purpose contrary to human rights. In short: no freedom for fascists.

It is with this article that the European Court of Human Rights has dismissed the actions brought by the Revisionist Pierre Barré, then by Roger Garaudy.

Sure, you can say that judges are freemasons vilified by Jews, but make no mistake, these judges have their hands free, and they are in a strong position, because in the end, the majority of people accept.

Likewise, you can believe that these articles are a Masonic lodges manufacturing orders from world Jewry, to establish a global dictatorship, but it remains, it reflects the thinking of the majority of our contemporaries. And that is why it has strength.

I never get tired to remind the teaching of Alain Girard, a Sorbonne a senior lecturer, who, almost 50 years emphasize that *"no government, but above all, no lifestyle governing relations between men, can not have any duration without the tacit approval, if not explicit, from all or any greater number. The normal life of a society requires the consent of its members to the values that support it and define it. It does not need men to be aware of these values, because they are expressed in their behavior. It is not necessary that public opinion, the basis of power, manifested itself to be. What she has most profound and essential, one might say without any paradox, remains mostly hidden."*

The anti-revisionist repression strengthens, because she benefits from tacit approval of a majority of the people, for which our message is intolerable. In this case, lobbies, law and justice are only emanations of a society. If tomorrow I am assassinated, or simply arrested then, as in 2010, extradited to France to be imprisoned, my case will create a small wave, but it will disappear very quickly, I know it, and my opponents as well for that matter. That's why, they will not hesitate whenever they have the opportunity.

I nourished no illusion. England is not a safe haven. I am an extradited and jailed in respite. But this will not prevent me from continuing to the end.



I thank also Mr. Paris, this lord of Lawyers which, despite this lost battle, does not want to give up.

Pleading that he should have given to the Constitutional Council will be online in a few days. Already he is considering bringing the matter at European level. I encourage him, because in the situation that is ours, no defense means should be neglected. Who knows what tomorrow will bring?

Beyond the law, however, I think the revisionism will prevail, not because it has earned the right to speak, but, because, times have changed, masses will finally be receptive to its message.

In the meantime, it will take hotheads to continue to maintain glowing coals. It will take desperadoes to accept losing everything and question everything, that the torch can be transmitted. Certainly, we still will know many setbacks, but I remind the beautiful quote by American lawyer-writer Jack Addington: *"Never accept defeat, you may be one step to the success."*

Good evening.